UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

QIUZI HU, et al.,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiffs,

v.

JOSE M. PLEHN-DUJOWICH, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-01791-JCS

ORDER REGARDING ASSIGNMENT OF CASE TO SETTLEMENT JUDGE

Re: Dkt. No. 113

This case was previously assigned to Magistrate Judge Elizabeth Laporte, and all parties consented to a magistrate judge presiding over the case for all purposes pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c). Upon referral from Judge Laporte, the undersigned magistrate judge held multiple settlement conferences with the parties, ultimately leading to an agreement on a class settlement. Judge Laporte granted the parties' motion for preliminary approval of that settlement on September 16, 2019.

The undersigned magistrate judge was assigned to preside over the case after Judge Laporte's retirement from the Court. Because the undersigned was involved in the parties' settlement negotiations, any party may have the case reassigned to a different presiding judge if they so choose. No later than December 6, 2019, the parties are instructed to file a joint statement indicating that either: (1) all parties waive their rights to have this action reassigned, and instead consent to have the undersigned magistrate judge preside over this action for all purposes, notwithstanding the undersigned's previous involvement in settlement negotiations; or (2) not all parties waive that right, in which case this action will be reassigned. Any party is free to withhold consent without adverse consequences.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 19, 2019

chief Magistrate Judge